UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 Case No.: 3:17-cv-00683-MMD-WGC STEVEN CITY BROOMFIELD, 4 Order Plaintiff 5 Re: ECF No. 79 v. 6 ROMEO ARANAS, et. al., 7 **Defendants** 8 9 Before the court is Plaintiff's motion for leave to file supplemental briefing in reply to 10 Defendants' motion for summary judgment, stating that he did not know he had to file a reply to 11 the motion. (ECF No. 79.) 12 Defendants filed their motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 40.) Plaintiff filed a 13 response. (ECF Nos. 59, 61, 67, 72.) Defendants filed a reply brief. (ECF No. 77.) 14 Plaintiff also filed his own motion for summary judgment. (ECF Nos. 47, 47-1, 50-1.) 15 Defendants filed a response. (ECF Nos. 53, 55-1 to 55-8.) Plaintiff filed a reply. (ECF No. 78.) 16 Briefing on these motions is complete. Plaintiff need not file a reply to Defendants' 17 motion. He is only permitted to file his response/opposition, and then Defendants file a reply 18 brief, which completes the briefing on the motion. See Local Rule 7-2. 19 Therefore, Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 79) is **DENIED**. 20 IT IS SO ORDERED. 21 Dated: May 19, 2020 22 William G. Cobb 23 United States Magistrate Judge